<div align="center">**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</div>

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action dated February 16, 2007. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Eick, *et al.* (US 5,812,124).

The rejection of these claims is discussed below.

The Rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Eick, *et al.* Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested, as Eick, *et al.* fails to disclose each and every element as recited in this claim.

> A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claims 1, 10, and 15

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia, a processor being configured to accept search results; a user interface being adapted to apply control signals responsive to user input indicating a first feature of each of said search results; said processor being configured to generate display data including multiple symbols corresponding to respective ones of said search results such that ones of said search results having a same value of said first feature are aggregated such that said ones are displayed as a single symbol.* Claims 10 and 15 recite similar elements. Eick, *et al.* fails to disclose these claimed features.

Eick, *et al.* is directed towards subjecting a large schedule of data items having multiple attributes to consecutive selection criteria in order to reduce the number of individual television programs to a manageable group that can be visually searched for a

desired data item having a selected subset of the attributes.[1] To accomplish this end, Eick, *et al.* teaches a hierarchical approach to locating, for example, a television program of interest by enabling sequential selection of search filters based upon attributes of the television program. For instance, Eick, *et al.* discloses that a menu can include a list of topics, including a "sports" topic.[2] If the "sports" topic is selected, several buttons are displayed to the user, including "Baseball", "Football", "Basketball", "Soccer", "All", "Hockey", "Golf", "Racing", and "Other" buttons, wherein except for the "All" button, each of the buttons displayed represents a narrow subgroup of the overall category of "sports".[3] If the "Basketball" button is selected, a display presenting all basketball programs that will be airing over a twelve hour period is provided to a user.[4]

Eick, *et al.* also teaches that, rather than searching for programs based upon category, a search for a program can be undertaken based upon title of the program. In an example discussed in Eick, *et al.,* a user may wish to locate a desired program entitled "Nova."[5] To begin this search, the user selects a "search" button from a menu and is provided a first display of an interactive alphanumeric selection sequence.[6] To begin the search for the desired program titled "Nova", a user selects directional arrows on a remote control and selects a subset of letters that include the letter "N".[7] Another screen is provided that further narrows possible selections to letters in the previously selected subset of letters, and to locate "Nova" the user selects the letter "N".[8] Thereafter yet another screen is provided that further narrows the search criteria, including titles of television programs and combinations of letters.[9] In the "Nova" example, the user selects the letters "NO" and is provided with yet another display that includes two possible television programs.[10] Once the user selects the desired "Nova" television program, a

---

[1] Eick, *et al.,* col. 1, lines 9-15
[2] Eick, *et al.,* col. 7, line 50 – col. 8, line 2, Fig. 8
[3] Eick, *et al.,* col. 8, lines 2-10, Fig. 9
[4] Eick, *et al.,* Fig. 15
[5] Eick, *et al.,* col. 9, lines 61-67
[6] Eick, *et al.,* col. 9, lines 57-60, Fig. 5, Fig. 16
[7] Eick, *et al.,* col. 9, lines 61-67, Fig. 17
[8] Eick, *et al.,* col. 9, line 67-col. 10, line 5, Fig. 19
[9] Eick, *et al.,* Fig. 21
[10] Eick, *et al.,* Fig. 22

Docket No.: US020031(PHB-10-6235)

graph illustrating when such program is airing and on what channels the program is airing is presented to the user.[11]

The Examiner asserts that this sequential filtering of data in a large schedule of data items anticipates aspects recited in the claims. This assertion is respectfully traversed. In particular, as noted above, claim 1 requires *a user interface being adapted to apply control signals responsive to user input indicating a first feature of each of said search results; said processor being configured to generate display data including multiple symbols corresponding to respective ones of said search results such that ones of said search results having a same value of said first feature are aggregated such that said ones are displayed as a single symbol.* Thus, the first feature is indicated by a user, and search results having a same value of the first feature are aggregated such that those search results are displayed as a single symbol. In contrast, Eick, *et al.* operates in the reverse. More specifically, according to Eick, *et al.,* when a first feature is indicated by a user, a group or subgroup is <u>expanded</u> to illustrate more specific items underneath such group or subgroup, which is in direct contrast to <u>aggregating</u> search results having a same value of a first feature indicated by a user. Thus, Eick, *et al.* fails to disclose each and every limitation as recited in claim 1, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 11

Claim 2 requires *said display data including symbols corresponding to multiple instances of a subset of said search results having a second feature and the same value of said first feature, each of said subset of said search results being selectively displayable by said user interface developed along a second axis of said display area.* Claim 11 recites similar elements. Eick, *et al.* does not disclose these claimed aspects. Rather, Eick, *et al.* teaches that programs can be displayed in a grid with axes of channel and time. In other words, Eick, *et al.* teaches that time is displayed along a first axis and channels are displayed along a second axis, and a television program is placed into the grid according to the channel that will air the program and the time the program will be aired. This is in contrast to outputting said symbols for display by said user interface in

---

[11] Eick, *et al.,* Fig. 23

the format of a list extending along a first axis of a display area and each of said search results being selectively displayable by said user interface developed along a second axis of the display area as required by claim 2 (or similar requirements of claim 11).

Claim 7

Claim 7 requires *said ones may be selectively aggregated about chosen second features.* The Examiner asserts that items are aggregated together for having the same title and different times. This assertion is respectfully traversed. Even if this is true, then items are only aggregated about a first feature (title) and <u>not</u> a second feature. Additionally, as noted above, Eick, *et al.* fails to disclose *a user interface being adapted to apply control signals responsive to user input indicating a first feature of each of said search results; said processor being configured to generate display data including multiple symbols corresponding to respective ones of said search results such that ones of said search results having a same value of said first feature are aggregated such that said ones are displayed as a single symbol* as required by claim 1, from which the subject claim depends. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Other Dependent Claims

Other dependent claims not specifically mentioned above are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies from their respective base claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-19 distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DRIGGS, HOGG & FRY CO., L.P.A.

Michael J. Medley   Reg. No. 57,058
Driggs, Hogg & Fry Co., L.P.A.
38500 Chardon Road
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094
Phone: 1.440.391.5100
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Please direct all further correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Registration No. 51,742
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615